UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/787,266	02/26/2004	Guy Hubert Culeron	AA-615M2	5154	
	7590 03/08/201 R & GAMBLE COMP	EXAMINER			
Global Legal Department - IP			DOUYON, LORNA M		
Sycamore Building - 4th Floor 299 East Sixth Street		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
CINCINNATI,	ОН 45202	1796			
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
			03/08/2010	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/787,266	CULERON ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Lorna M. Douyon	1796		

	Lorna M. Douyon	1796	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>22 February 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO	R ALLOWANCE.	
1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavit al (with appeal fee) in compliance	, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I	ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f	).		
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extra under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the siset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount on the corresponding amount of the corresponding a	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	iled within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed wi	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
AMENDMENTS			
<ol> <li>The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below</li> </ol>	sideration and/or search (see NOT		cause
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	•	lucing or simplifying tl	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	cted claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12		mpliant Amendment (l	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	<del></del>		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s).		•	_
7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [ how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: None. Claim(s) objected to: None. Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 11-15. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: None.		be entered and an e	xpianation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fail:	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
<ol> <li>The request for reconsideration has been considered but <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u></li> </ol>	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
<ul><li>12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (</li><li>13. ☐ Other:</li></ul>	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/Lorna M Douyon/		
	Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 1796	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of the same reasons set forth in the final rejection. As stated in the previous office action, the present claim 1 requires "a mesh and/or sponge located slightly within, and/or at the tip of the nozzle of said dispenser", and the secondary reference to Pritchett teaches that the nozzle 12 communicates with an inner axial downwardly open tube 11 which forms a top foamer unit housing, and fitting closely in tube 11 is a cylindrical plastic tube 81 having ultrasonically welded across its open ends a disk of coarse nylon mesh 82 (bottom end) and fine nylon mesh 83 (top end), (see col. 7, lines 35-45 and Figure 1 in Pritchett). It is clear from this teaching and Figure 1 that mesh 83 and mesh 82 are located at the top foamer unit housing which contains the nozzle, and mesh 83, as seen in Figure 1 is in the interior passage of the nozzle.

In addition, please note that the present claims 1-8, 11, 13-15 are also rejected over Petri in view of Lund; and claim 12 over Petri in view of Lund in further view of Loth. The secondary reference to Lund teaches in col. 6, lines 2-4 that the screens or combination of screens can be placed at any angle or orientation with respect to spray discharge orifice 118. See also Figure 1. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have packaged the microemulsion of Petri in the non-aerosol foam dispensing system of Lund having screens or combination of screens at the spray discharge orifice because Petri teaches in col. 6, lines 23-44 that the microemulsions may be packaged in a variety of suitable detergent packaging known to those skilled in the art, and Lund teaches such dispenser which provides a high quality foamed spray.